Adenauer Knuckles Under at Moscow: A Dulles Defeat, See Page 2.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NO. 34 SEPTEMBER 19, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Is Eisenhower A Communist Front?

John J. Abt and Joseph Forer, counsel for the Communist Party, filed a 270-page brief with the U. S. Supreme Court last Tuesday. The Court has agreed to hear the party's appeal this Fall against the order requiring it to register with the Subversive Activities Control Board. The Court will pass upon the constitutionality of the McCarran Act, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which Congress passed over President Truman's veto. If a majority finds the Act unconstitutional and throws out the registration order, it will add a mighty push to the tide now carrying this country back toward its traditional freedoms. We believe the Court will do so.

The Communist Party has been shopping around for a lawyer of national reputation to argue the case before the Court, but as yet has been unsuccessful. There is no sign of a new Wendell Willkie. Though the implications of this appeal are well understood among lawyers, even the best of them seem to have some special reason why they should not argue it. Voltaire and Lord Erskine, Jefferson and Andrew Hamilton, are invoked in every law school commencement, but few are found to imitate them. It is not what happens to the American Communist party which makes this case crucial; it is what the outcome will do to the atmosphere of this country.

The Nursemaid Theory of Society

This legislation is based on premises completely foreign to those which lie at the foundations of free government. The McCarran Act is based on the analogy of a Pure Food and Drug Act for ideas. It assumes that ordinary people and free debate are not to be trusted. It has its roots in the Nursemaid Theory of Society, which Communists in power also practice. This holds that an all-wise government must decide what ideas are "good" and what ideas are "bad," lest otherwise the poor not-to-be-trusted people be ideologically poisoned, misled or "subverted."

The Act set up a Subversive Activities Control Board to compile the equivalent to an *Index Expurgatorius* for American political life, like that which the Vatican has so long wielded over world literature. Organizations found to be "subversive," whether Communist, Communist fronts or Communist "infiltrated" are forced to register, subjected to severe legal disabilities; required to label themselves, their publications and their broadcasts as "communistic." The idea is that ordinary people will thus know what they may join and listen to.

Guilt by Parallelism

This Act is intended to drive Communists underground. It would deprive them of the right to travel and to work in defense plants. It would turn them into second class citizens. All this has been happening anyway. But the Act, if the registration order—its cornerstone—goes into effect, will legalize and widen the process. Any Communist who fails to register will be subject to five years in jail, a fine of $10,000 or both. But how determine who is a Communist if they have torn up their membership cards and gone underground?

The basic answer of this Act is that Communist fronts and Communist members can be detected by parallelism. This theory of parallelism was further developed in the new standards for determining membership which Congress added to the Act by the Humphrey-Morse-Douglas amendments of August, 1954. The basic yardstick is the "extent to which" an organization or a man advances ideas which are also advanced by Communists. This is a most dangerous rubber yardstick, as the late John W. Davis objected in opposing this law when it was still the Mundt-Nixon bill.

Can The Board Read Men's Minds?

A vivid example of how dangerous this yardstick can be was furnished just a few days before the new brief was filed. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was before the Subversive Activities Control Board on a proposed order to register as a Communist front. Its campaign for peace and co-existence was held to be part of the proof that it was Communist dominated. The Board has already ruled that it does not matter whether an organization's aims are good or bad, to America's interest as well as Russia's. "Parallelism" condemns it. Now in 1945 General Eisenhower cabled a rally held by this same Council, "American-Soviet friendship is one of the cornerstones on which the edifice of peace should be built." In 1955, at Geneva, this is exactly the premise on which Eisenhower operated. In this the Administration parallels declared Soviet aims for peace and co-existence. Is Eisenhower then a Communist front?

Such slanderous parallels were McCarthy's stock-in-trade. To draw them is the Subversive Activities Control Board's business. It is expected to read men's minds. The law gives it the impossible task of deciding who holds or advances ideas on his own, and who holds or advances the same ideas because he is a Communist, a front or an "infiltrated" dupe. The existence of such power makes it hazardous to advocate anything the Communists also advocate, however innocuous. It poisons the atmosphere of free discussion. It cripples the fight for world peace. Its dangers are high-lighted for the Court by the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship case. Humbler citizens are in danger of being proscribed for advocating under less respectable auspices what a five-star General as President is converting into national policy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Der Alte Fuchs, Like *Der Schone Adolf,* Ends Up Retreating from Moscow

During the past year no Western statesman has taken so sour a view as Adenauer of the Soviet Union. He has disparaged negotiation, diagnosed the Russian peace drive as a reflection of serious internal weakness, implied that if only Washington would wait the Soviet Union would collapse from within.

When Adenauer himself accepted an invitation to Moscow, he talked big of preconditions. His own march to Moscow was to be a triumph of dealing from strength. The quotations in the adjoining column from *Newsweek* are typical of the kind of boastful pap fed the American press from Bonn and through the State Department from Washington.

Though the American press is doing its best to hide it, the Moscow visit ended in the biggest pratt-fall of postwar diplomacy. Adenauer, too, like Hitler before him, has ended up in an ignominious retreat from Moscow. The official documents show the Russians got exactly what they wanted, resumption of diplomatic relations, with no conditions and no promises.

Adenauer's claim that he got a promise from Moscow on German prisoners is not borne out by the official communique or by the letters exchanged between the Soviet Premier and the German Chancellor. On the contrary the Russians have set up a counter-claim to Soviet citizens still on German soil and held to their contention that they will only negotiate the prisoner question with their East as well as our own West Germans.

What The Germans Prefer to Forget

There is little reason to doubt that many of these prisoners are, indeed, war criminals. "We cannot forget the millions of people," Bulganin told Adenauer, "shot, gassed or burned alive in German concentration camps. . . . Over five and a half million completely innocent people were killed at the camps of Maidanek and Oswiecim." These were German crimes, and it was good to have the Germans reminded of them.

If Adenauer expected to be offered a separate deal if he would withdraw from NATO, he must have been disappointed. Kruschchev spoke quite plainly on the subject, saying "we would be stupid to help all Germany to join NATO, thereby strengthening the forces mustered against us." But he added:

"It is too late now to raise the question of annulling the Paris agreements, they exist. . . . To raise the question of the German Federal Republic's withdrawal from NATO is also unreal and would sound like an ultimatum from our side. We do not pose this question. That is why, proceeding from the real conditions which have developed today, the Soviet government has proposed to establish diplomatic relations with the German Federal Republic and to create conditions for the favorable development of trade between us. . . . If it is not advantageous for you to develop trade with us, then you don't have to do it. We can do without it."

How Bold and Brave He Blew!

"Adenauer ruled out in advance any resumption of Soviet-German diplomatic ties except on Bonn's own conditions: Prior 'frank' understandings on German unity (i.e. free, internationally supervised all-German elections), and the release of some 9,000 German war prisoners (out of an original 75,000) believed still in Russian hands. He set a five-day limit on the talks and served notice he would not even consider diplomatic relations if the Russians 'refuse to make any concessions.'"

—*Newsweek, Sept. 12.*

Not A Seduction Scene

These are quotations from the official texts, little of which appeared in American press coverage. They indicate that the Russians set out simply to establish relations and to trade with Bonn as part of their policy of seeking relaxation of tension. They were not out to woo or tempt the West Germans. This is not the seduction plot Bonn pictured; like many young ladies in similar positions, the West Germans were suffering from illusions and over-valued their own charms.

The upshot was Adenauer's deflation, and his agreement to just what the Russians wanted. With this collapsed the Adenauer-Acheson-Dulles vision of a new *Der Tag* on which a Germany rearmed (at American expense) would lay down terms for Moscow's withdrawal from East Germany and East Europe.

Bitterest pill for the Germans is that events are reducing them to secondary importance. Their reunification is a burning question only for themselves. Everybody else in Europe knows reunification will not solve the German problem but merely set the stage for new demands. The Saar, the Oder-Neisse lands, East Prussia will follow, and then a desire to repeat what the Kaiser dreamed and Der Fuehrer screamed. A generation in cold storage would do them good.

Clues to The News:

COMMUNIST CHINA: By a compromise which recalls in reverse the old days of colonialism, the release of the remaining American civilians held in Communist China has been negotiated. India will act as "protecting power" for Chinese students in the United States. Those who want to go home but lack funds or feel themselves "obstructed" from departing may apply for aid to the Indian Embassy. India may also, on request of Peking, investigate.

The day after this news from Geneva, Senator George in an interview with the United Press (which few papers carried) again called for a meeting between Dulles and Chou En-lai. The release of Americans held in China was a triumph for George, who coaxed, prodded and led the Eisenhower Administration into these talks, as he did into the conference "at the summit." Last July 24 George warned that an "actual flare-up" over the Formosa straits was "almost certain" unless the U. S. agreed to a meeting with China at the Foreign Ministers level. He implied that Peking would resort to force if it saw no way out by negotiation.

The State Department is chilly toward George these days. Dulles is as unwilling to talk with Chou as he was to have Eisenhower talk with the Russians. But the tide is the other way. Already the sometimes (in such matters) quasi-official *Washington Post* (Sept. 7) saw "the day seemingly . . . approaching when the Administration, if it will not welcome Chinese Communist membership in the UN, at least will not interpose a veto."

Clues to The News:

ARGENTINA: Gen. Lucero, Minister of the Army, no doubt unintentionally, established himself as the Wit of the Week. He rejected the proposal of Peron's Confederation of Labor to mobilize its 6,000,000 members as a civil militia. His reason: "it would be unconstitutional." (Many people will be surprised to hear that Argentina has one.)

The incident threw a flash of light into the murky Argentine situation, revealing where the ultimate power now lies. Peron's laborites asked permission, not of Peron, but of his ostensible subordinate, the Minister of the Army. Lucero, who saved Peron from an abortive naval revolt last June, still seems to be the boss.

A labor militia would give Peron armed support of his own, render him independent of the Army. It would also have a revolutionary potential, and Peron is capable of moving leftward if necessary to retain power. He is a character out of Plutarch, a social demagogue in the pre-Augustan Roman tradition, raising up the proletariat against the oligarchy.

What may yet save Peron is that the Army chiefs can veto but seem unable to rule. Peron's strength is that his various opponents have no ready substitute for him, fear the mob behind him. Argentina has rarely known democracy or freedom except as a thin crust. While his enemies hesitate, Peron has time to maneuver. He is settling his conflict with the Catholic Church (six leading anti-clericals have been dropped from office since June), and offering unprecedented privileges to Standard Oil.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind the Scenes of Middle Eastern Policy

Why Israel Fears A Danger to The Negev in the New Dulles Proposal

The State Department has been playing a game of almost "Oriental" subtlety in the Middle East. Its aim has been to bring Egypt to terms. Egypt is the natural leader of the Arab world by civilization and religious pre-eminence. But fresh from its struggle to get rid of the last vestiges of British occupation, Egypt regards U. S. talk of a Soviet menace with suspicion as new excuse for putting foreign bases on her soil. She is therefore "neutralist" and gave a neutralist cast to the Egyptian-dominated Arab League.

So the U. S. set out to break up the Arab League, to join the "northern tier" of Arab States with non-Arab Turkey and Pakistan. The first open signal of what was going on came last December when Turkey rejected Egypt's proposal for a regional alliance linked with the Arab League. Iraq then joined the Turkish-Pakistan alliance backed by the U. S. and Britain.

This scheme was sold all around with a bewildering series of sometimes contradictory arguments. The Turks were told this would be a first step to the resumption of their old hegemony over the Arabs. The Arabs were told this would bring Turkey into alliance with them against Israel. The Israeli were told that this would help them by breaking up the Arab League. Iraq was told this would reduce the importance of its main Arab rival, Egypt. The Egyptians were told that unless they came to terms and joined a Western military alliance, they would be left out in the cold.

Somewhere in such an alliance, room must be made for Israel. Had the Arabs crushed the Jews in 1948, as some British and American diplomats hoped, the problem would have been settled. But since they did not, and Israel is not only a fact but a military power in the area with strong political support inside the U. S., its elimination is no longer possible.

The first sign that there might be some kind of bargaining going on between Cairo and Washington in this respect came last March when Egypt said she might join the Western alliance if given the Negev. Subsequently Egypt began a flirtation with Moscow which alarmed Washington; Neguib next year is to visit the Russian capital.

Against this background the recent Dulles speech on Israel is seen to face two ways. On the one hand it warns Egypt that if she goes too far toward the Soviets, the U. S. may make Israel and the Northern States her military base in the Middle East, further weakening Egypt.

On the other hand, the speech hints at benefits for Egypt if Cairo goes along. What has the Israeli alarmed in the speech is not merely its reference to boundary changes, which might be minor corrections, but the passage in which Dulles said "the difficulty is increased by the fact that even territory which is barren has acquired a sentimental significance."

More Than Sentimental

The only barren territory involved on the Israeli side is the Negev. This passage may encourage Egypt to believe that there might be serious bargaining on its proposal of last March. But Sharrett in Jerusalem has made it clear that Israel will not give up the Negev. If the Dulles proposal for aid in resettlement of Arab refugees and the achievement of peace is dependent on this kind of territorial sacrifice to Egypt, the proposal is only a brilliantly devised trap.

The alarming passage is typical Dulles. Its smooth wording would down-grade the Negev by speaking of it as an area having only "sentimental" significance. But for Israel the Negev is a matter of national life or death, not of sentiment. If this huge barren area can be developed, and the development has begun, then the new State can breathe and expand without coming into conflict with its neighbors. Without the Negev, Israel is only a collection of precarious corridors between the mountains and the seas.

When the Israeli Ambassador, Abba Eban, praised the Dulles proposal in a speech to the Israel Bond drive in Washington on September 11, he asked "Is there not a serious danger that this proposal as it stands contains a built-in deadlock with somber potentialities of disillusion?" That question becomes clearer against this background.

Profit Figures Most Newspapers Suppressed: The Bonanza That Is Aircraft

The biggest financial success story of the week was given amazingly little attention by the press. An industry in which a company can earn every year for three years almost as much or more as its net investment is quite a business. But when the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee last Tuesday released a report on the profits of the aircraft manufacturing industry, few papers reported the stupendous profit margins it disclosed.

We give a sampling of them here. The report was tentative and circumspect, reflecting the cautious subcommittee chairman, Lyndon Johnson, no crusader. The figures were all based on those furnished by the companies themselves to the SEC. They show the stake this industry has in the maintenance of international tension.

The report is based on the figures as reported by the aircraft companies themselves to the SEC. For the industry as a whole it shows the percentage of profits to net worth during the past three years as follows:

	Before Taxes	After Taxes
1952	46.6	17.3
1953	60.1	21.0
1954	60.1	29.4

The company with the most profitable record, Glenn L. Martin, paid no taxes in 1952 or 1953 and very little in 1954. Its earnings were 1,029.8 percent on net worth in 1952 and 136.6 in 1954. In 1955, it earned 76.6 percent on net worth before taxes and 72.9 percent on net worth after taxes. [These figures looked so startling in the cold print of the report that we rechecked them with the subcommittee by phone to make sure they were not a misprint.]

Consolidated Vultee (now General Dynamics), maker of the B-36, was another big profit maker. Here are its profit ratios to net worth during the three years:

	Before Taxes	After Taxes
1952	45.4	25.0
1953	38.7	21.4
1954	139.0	65.9

Here are the figures for another maker of big bombers, Boeing:

	Before Taxes	After Taxes
1952	86.1	24.4
1953	87.1	30.1
1954	93.3	45.0

The tables show how completely this industry depends on war and war scares. The industry as a whole went into the red as soon as the war ended, picked up with the cold war, hit another peak with the Korean war and has zoomed to war-time profit levels since.

"Now once again as a result of increased international tensions," the Senate report says, "and particularly as a result of the recent exhibit of modern types of aircraft known to have been produced in quantity by the U.S.S.R., increased emphasis is being placed on aircraft production. . . . But," the report adds mildly, "surely, in this renewed effort no one should be allowed to make excessive or unjustified profits."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once The Son of An Erring Mother Gets Cleared He Can't Be Too Careful

Homecoming of the Loyal Coast Guardsman — A Playlet in One Act

Mother: Oh, George, it's been *so* long.

George: Doesn't seem unusually long to me, Mother.

Mother: Son, do you know it's been exactly five years, three months and nine days since you were last home?

George: But you remember the wording of my loyalty clearance decision, Mother? That's not too long a time for a boy whose "relationship to his mother has not been close." You wouldn't want me to risk my clearance, would you?

Mother (wiping her eyes): Of course, not, dear. But how silly of me, going on like this, when you've brought a nice friend home with you. Won't you introduce him?

George: Well, he's not exactly a friend, Mother. But he was kind enough to come home with me. Just to see that everything was—well, you know . . . I thought it'd be best to have a witness just in case. So I asked our local FBI man if he wouldn't come along. This is Agent Donald Thomas, Mother.

Mother: Well, I'm happy to know you, Mr. Thomas. Won't you join us at dinner? Just let me straighten things up here a minute. You know I didn't expect you, George, and everything's in such disarray.

George: Mother, what's that you're pushing under the sofa pillows?

Mother: Why, nothing, dear.

George: Let me see it. Give that to me, this instant.

Mother: Oh, dear, it's just some magazine a neighbor left.

George: Mother, it's *The Nation,* and you know it. And you promised me you were going to lay off all that sort of thing.

Mother: I swear I haven't touched anything more radical than the *Ladies Home Journal* since—since that awful time they denied you your commission. This—this just was left here by that neighbor.

George: Well, you shouldn't associate with such neighbors.

Mother (humbly, still tidying up frantically): I know, George. I promise. Anyway, *The Nation* isn't so radical. I bet even Mr. Thomas sometimes reads it.

Mr. Thomas (politely): I've often read *The Nation,* Mrs. Martin—as part of my official duties, of course.

A Boy's Best Friend Had Better Be His Dog

"It has been found that Gaston's relationship to his mother has not been close, especially during his scholastic and more mature years. In fact, the mother-son relationship was less close than in the ordinary case and no improper influence exists."

—U. S. Coast Guard statement announcing that "in accordance with the basic American principles of fair play and justice" it is awarding a reserve Ensign's commission to Norton Pierre Jerome Gaston even though his mother had once been active in the American Russian Institute, the California Labor School, and the Independent Progressive Party of California.

George: Mother, what are these under the table? Are you selling benefit tickets again?

Mother: It's really all right, son. It's just a benefit for that Republican Women's Auxiliary.

George: But you promised, Mother. That's political. And you know one thing leads to another. You promised to keep away from benefits. First thing you know you'll be back helping the foreign born or something. Oh, you make me so nervous, Mother. And I worked so hard for my commission.

Mother: Now, now. Just sit down and dinner will soon be ready.

George: Mother, I'm sorry but I don't think we can stay to dinner after all.

Mother: Oh, son.

George: Well, I just remembered I have another appointment that's awfully urgent. But I'll be seeing you again soon.

Mother: Oh, George. Don't make it so long this time. I promise . . . you know what.

George: Sure, Mother.

Mother (calling after them as they go down the stairs): And George please be careful. I get so worried when I read about those Russian submarines that seem to come up along the coast every spring.

George (firmly): That will do, Mother. *That's* classified.

We'll Be Glad to Send Free Sample Copies of Any Issue to Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**..... **State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**..... **State**.....

*** $1 extra for Canada.** 9/19/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED